## **REMARKS**

The Office Action mailed February 16, 2006 has been received and reviewed. In the Office Action, the examiner rejects claims 1-4, 12-15, and 38-71 under 35 U.S.C. § 112 as being indefinite. In response, Applicant has cancelled claims 2-4 and amended claims 1, 12-15, 38-40, 47-57, and 63-71 to improve readability and to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. Applicant submits that these amendments overcome the rejections under § 112. Applicant further asserts that these amendments are supported in the specification and add no new matter.

In the Office Action, the Examiner states that claim 4 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejections under § 112 and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicant respectfully thanks the Examiner for the allowable subject matter.

Accordingly, Applicant has cancelled claims 2-4 and amended claim 1 to include all of the limitations of claims 2-4. Thus, Applicant submits that claim 1 is in condition for allowance. Furthermore, claims 12-15 are also allowable for at least the reason that they depend from an allowable base claim.

The Examiner also states that claims 38-71 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejections under § 112. Accordingly, Applicant has amended claims 38-40, 47-57, and 63-71 to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. Applicant submits that these amendments overcome the rejections of claims 38-71 under § 112 and put these claims in condition for allowance.

Applicant has also newly added claims 73 and 74 which incorporate various elements recited in amended claim 1. Applicant submits that none of the reference cited by the Examiner, either alone or in

combination, recite all of the elements contained in claims 73 and 74. Thus, Applicant asserts that claims 73 and 74 are in condition for allowance.

Applicant asserts that the claims, as currently amended, are in condition for allowance. In the event that the examiner finds any remaining impediment to the prompt allowance of any of these claims, which could be clarified in a telephone conference, the examiner is respectfully urged to initiate the same with the undersigned.

DATED this /5 day of June, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

A. John Pate
Reg. No. 36 234

Attorney for Applicant

Date: June 15, 2006

PATE PIERCE & BAIRD 550 Parkside Tower 215 South State Street Salt Lake City, Utah 84111 Telephone: (801) 530-0330

Facsimile: (801) 530-5955